IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA CHARLESTON DIVISION

IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY))	MDL No. 2:18-mn-2873-RMG
LITIGATION)	ORDER
)))	This Order Relates to: The Member Cases Listed in Exhibit A

Before the Court is the Defense Leadership's motion to dismiss without prejudice all claims brought by plaintiffs in the member cases listed in Exhibit A for failure to serve an executed and completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet. (Dkt. No. 2537.) For the reasons set forth below, the motion is granted.

I. Background

CMO No. 5 governs the form, procedure and schedule for completion and service of Plaintiff Fact Sheets ("PFS") for all Plaintiffs in this multidistrict litigation. Each PFS must be "substantially complete in all respects" and, if not, the parties must engage the Deficiency Dispute Resolution Process that culminates in the Defense Leadership's opportunity to move to dismiss without prejudice the claims of any Plaintiffs whose PFS remain deficient. (Dkt. No. 205 ¶ 9.) Dismissal without prejudice is subject to reinstatement if that Plaintiff serves a completed PFS pursuant to Paragraphs 22 through 26 of CMO No. 5. (*Id.* ¶ 16.)

II. <u>Legal Standard</u>

A defendant may move to dismiss any claim against it if the plaintiff fails to prosecute, fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or fails to comply with a Court order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Court may also dismiss an action for failure to obey a discovery order

under Rule 37(b)(2). In determining whether dismissal is appropriate, the Court should consider "(i) the degree of personal responsibility of the plaintiff; (ii) the amount of prejudice caused the defendant; (iii) the existence of a history of deliberately proceeding in a dilatory fashion, and (iv) the existence of a sanction less drastic than dismissal." *Ballard v. Carlson,* 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989). However, these four factors "are not a rigid four-prong test," and "the propriety of a dismissal... depends on the particular circumstances of the case." *Id.* at 95. Furthermore, "[r]igid application of these factors is unnecessary if the district court provided an 'explicit and clear' warning that the failure to comply with the order would result in dismissal of the case." *Bailey v. Edwards,* 573 F. App'x 268, 269 (4th Cir. 2014); *see also Coles v. Northcutt,* 574 F. App'x 268 (4th Cir. 2014) ("[G]enerally, a district court does not abuse its discretion in dismissing an action when a party fails to comply with a reasonable court order after being warned of the consequences of neglecting the court's direction.").

Courts are given broad discretion to manage an MDL docket containing voluminous cases. See, e.g., In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Prod Liab. Litig., 496 F.3d 863, 867 (8th Cir. 2007). Because MDLs were created by Congress to encourage efficiency, "MDL courts must be able to establish schedules with firm cutoff dates if the coordinated cases are to move in a diligent fashion toward resolution by motion, settlement, or trial." Id. (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the transferee court has "greater discretion to organize, coordinate and adjudicate its proceedings, including the dismissal of cases for failure to comply with its orders." Id.

III. <u>Discussion</u>

A completed PFS contains basic facts required by Defendants to assess the quality of the claims, and a Plaintiff's failure to provide such information may result in prejudice to a Defendant. *See, e.g., Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1234 (9th Cir. 2009)

("[T]he purpose of the Plaintiff's Fact Sheet was to give each defendant the specific information

necessary to defend the case against it, and that without this device, a defendant was unable to

mount its defense because it had no information about the plaintiff or the plaintiff's injuries outside

the allegations of the complaint."); In re Guidant Corp., 496 F.3d at 867 ("Given the time pressure

on a defendant that must investigate the claims of nearly 1,400 plaintiffs, we consider the danger

of prejudice substantial."). Moreover, a Plaintiff's delay or failure to provide a complete PFS may

impact the other Plaintiffs in this litigation "by unfairly diverting the time and attention of the court

away from their timely claims to that of [these plaintiffs]." In re Guidant Corp., 496 F.3d at 867.

Defense Leadership has engaged the Deficiency Dispute Resolution Process to seek a

completed PFS. Under these circumstances and in light of CMO No. 5, the Court finds that

granting the motion to dismiss is appropriate.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Defense Leadership's motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 2537) is

GRANTED. All claims brought by plaintiffs in the member cases listed in Exhibit A (Dkt. No.

2537-1) are dismissed without prejudice and subject to reinstatement pursuant to the procedure

set forth in CMO No. 5.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Richard Mark Gergel
Richard Mark Gergel

United States District Judge

August 23, 2022

Charleston, South Carolina

3

2:18-mn-02873-RMG Date Filed 08/23/22 Entry Number 2551 Page 4 of 5

EXHIBIT A

Plaintiffs Who Failed to Serve Plaintiff Fact Sheet

Banner Legal Boumil Legal Kyros Legal						
Plaintiff	Case Name	Docket	PFS Due Date	Delinquency Letter		
				Sent		
Beyuka Jr.,	Mickey Beyuka	2:21-cv-03051	12.29.21	01.14.22		
Mickey	Jr.					
Guedel,	Edward Guedel	2:21-cv-03983	03.16.22	04.29.22		
Edward						